



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/309,372      | 05/11/1999  | KENNETH M. LASSESEN  | 3797.77742          | 7410             |

28319 7590 02/21/2007

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
ATTORNEYS FOR CLIENT NOS. 003797 & 013797  
1100 13th STREET, N.W.  
SUITE 1200  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2176

| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE  | DELIVERY MODE |
|--|------------|---------------|
| 3 MONTHS                               | 02/21/2007 | PAPER         |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/309,372

Applicant(s)

LASSESEN, KENNETH M.

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 11/24/2006 to the original application filed 05/11/1999.

Claims 1-13 remain in this application. Claim 14 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 6, and 14 are independent claims.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Flanagan et al.** (US 6,993,471 – filed 11/1995) in view of **Kennelly et al.** (US 6,559,861, filed 03/09/1999).

Art Unit: 2176

**As to claim 6:**

Flanagan teaches a method of providing an electronic file (*e.g., online documents from the World Wide Web/ the Web document retrieved by the browser 88*) to a user (*e.g., the user 84*) [*see fig. 8 and col. 5, lines 1-17*] comprising the steps of:

at a receiving computer (*e.g., user's PC 84*):

- receiving the electronic file from a sending computer (*e.g., online documents from the World Wide Web/ the Web document retrieved by the browser 88*) [*see fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16*];
- allowing a user (*e.g., the user 84*) to select (*e.g., selects*) a language (*e.g., the desired target language*) in which at least a portion of the electronic file is to be displayed (*e.g., then displays*) [*see fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16*];
- inserting the translation obtained from the electronic file into a translated file (*e.g., HTML document (88) in language X is translated into HTML document (90) in language Y by machine translation system 80*) [*see fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16*]; and
- displaying the translated electronic file to the user (*e.g., then displays for the user 84 the translated document 90*) [*see fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16*].

Flanagan does not specifically teach “*assigning to at least one word in the electronic file a plurality of identifiers, wherein each identifier corresponds to a one of a plurality respective translations in the electronic file for the at least one word; and using an*

*identifier from the plurality of identifiers, wherein the identifier corresponds to the language selected by the user, to obtain, from the respective translations in the electronic file, a translation, in the language selected by the user for the at least one word.”*

Kennelly teaches assigning to at least one word in the electronic file a plurality of identifiers, wherein each identifier corresponds to a one of a plurality respective translations in the electronic file for the at least one word (*e.g., displays each of the available languages in a drop down menu box 218 of page 208... down menu box 218 of page 208 presents all available languages*); and using an identifier from the plurality of identifiers, wherein the identifier corresponds to the language selected by the user, to obtain, from the respective translations in the electronic file, a translation, in the language selected by the user for the at least one word (*e.g., when a user accesses system 10 and selects an Administrator page 208 (FIG. 7), logic within the management object that produces page 208 causes management object request processor 156 (FIG. 4) to traverse language directories 204, 205, 206 and determine which languages are available to the user. Each time the user selects Administrator page 208, management object request processor 156 reads all the subdirectories under root directory 220 and looks for the existence of corresponding data files 220en, 220jp, 220fr, e.g., language.txt. The data files 220en, 220jp, 220fr contain information regarding the corresponding languages. When management object request processor 156 locates a language.txt file in a subdirectory, processor 156 presumes that system 10 supports the corresponding language. Subsequently, system 10 displays each of the available languages in a drop*

Art Unit: 2176

*down menu box 218 of page 208. (FIG. 7) Drop down menu box 218 presents all available languages in the selected language, e.g., English. Alternatively, drop down menu box 218 may present each available language in that language, e.g., drop down menu box 218 could present the English option in the English language and the Japanese option in the Japanese language. The user can select the desired language in box 218, e.g., with a mouse. If the user selects a new language other than the default language (step 302), such as Japanese) [see fig. 7 and the discussion beginning at col. 7, line 9 and col. 9, line 4].*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Flanagan with Kennelly because Flanagan's teaching would have allowed non-English speaking Internet user to access and understand information available from the World Wide Web and related sources.

**As to claim 7:**

Flanagan teaches the electronic file is an HTML document (*e.g., HTML language X/ HTML language Y; see fig. 8*).

**As to claim 8:**

Flanagan teaches the translation for said at least one word is stored in a data structure on a server (*e.g., a Web Server; see fig. 8*).

**As to claim 9:**

Flanagan teaches the data structure is an array (*e.g., see the HTML data structure discussion, beginning at col.4, line 40*).

**As to claim 10:**

Flanagan teaches a Web browser displays the HTML document to the user (*e.g., The Web browser 82 then displays for the user 84 the translated document 90; col.5, lines 12-15*).

**As to claim 11:**

Flanagan teaches the translated HTML document is provided to the user via the Internet (*e.g., the World Wide Web; see the Abstract and fig. 8*).

**As to claim 12:**

Flanagan teaches a plurality of words in the HTML document are assigned a plurality of identifiers (*e.g., French if the user speaks French; col.5, lines 1-16*).

**As to claim 13:**

Flanagan teaches a plurality of phrases in the HTML document are assigned a plurality of identifiers that correspond to said translation (*e.g., machine translation is integrated into a Web browser... allow the user 84 to rapidly and automatically translate online documents from the World Wide Web 86 into his native language... The user 84 of the*

Art Unit: 2176

*multilingual browser 82 selects the desired target language, (e.g. French if the user speaks French), and the Web document retrieved by the browser 88 may be rapidly translated on-the-fly with a mouse click; col.5, lines 1-16).*

**As to claim 1:**

The rejection of claim 6 above is incorporated herein in full.

Flanagan does not specifically teach “*a first plurality of phrases, wherein each phrase of the first plurality of phrases is expressed in a plurality of languages; and a second plurality of phrases that are expressed in the language selected by the user.*”

Kennelly teaches a first plurality of phrases, wherein each phrase of the first plurality of phrases is expressed in a plurality of languages; and a second plurality of phrases that are expressed in the language selected by the user (*e.g., system 10 displays each of the available languages in a drop down menu box 218 of page 208. (FIG. 7) Drop down menu box 218 presents all available languages in the selected language, e.g., English. Alternatively, drop down menu box 218 may present each available language in that language, e.g., drop down menu box 218 could present the English option in the English language and the Japanese option in the Japanese language. The user can select the desired language in box 218, e.g., with a mouse. If the user selects a new language other than the default language (step 302), such as Japanese, system 10 executes HTML script*



Art Unit: 2176

*of page 208 and overrides the existing parameters 222) [see fig. 7 and the discussion beginning at col. 7, line 9 and col. 9, line 4].*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Flanagan with Kennelly because Flanagan's teaching would have allowed non-English speaking Internet user to access and understand information available from the World Wide Web and related sources.

**As to claim 2:**

Flanagan teaches the electronic file is received at the use's computer via the Internet (*e.g., documents available on the WWW and displayed by browser; col. 2, lines 18-61*).

**As to claims 3 and 4:**

Refer to the discussions of claims 7 and 10, respectively, for rejections.

**As to claim 5:**

Flanagan teaches the Web browser translates at least a portion of the HTML document into the language selected by the user (*e.g., machine translation is integrated into a Web browser... allow the user 84 to rapidly and automatically translate online documents from the World Wide Web 86 into his native language... the Web document retrieved by the browser 88 may be rapidly translated on-the-fly with a mouse click; col. 5, lines 1-16*).

### Response to Arguments

3. Applicants' arguments filed 11/24/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues in substance that Flanagan and Kennelly do not teach *receiving the electronic file from at the user's computer... a second plurality of phrases that are expressed in the language selected by the user* [Remarks, page 5].

In response, the Examiner respectfully submits that the mapping in the rejection above shows how the combination teaches the claim limitation. Flanagan teaches a method of providing an electronic file (*e.g., online documents from the World Wide Web/ the Web document retrieved by the browser 88*) to a user (*e.g., the user 84*) [see fig. 8 and col. 5, lines 1-17] comprising the steps of at a receiving computer (*e.g., user's PC 84*): receiving the electronic file from a sending computer (*e.g., online documents from the World Wide Web/ the Web document retrieved by the browser 88*) [see fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16]; allowing a user (*e.g., the user 84*) to select (*e.g., selects*) a language (*e.g., the desired target language*) in which at least a portion of the electronic file is to be displayed (*e.g., then displays*) [see fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16]; inserting the translation obtained from the electronic file into a translated file (*e.g., HTML document (88) in language X is translated into HTML document (90) in language Y by machine translation system 80*)

Art Unit: 2176

*[see fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16]; and displaying the translated electronic file to the user (e.g., then displays for the user 84 the translated document 90) [see fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16]. Kennelly teaches a first plurality of phrases, wherein each phrase of the first plurality of phrases is expressed in a plurality of languages; and a second plurality of phrases that are expressed in the language selected by the user (e.g., system 10 displays each of the available languages in a drop down menu box 218 of page 208. (FIG. 7) Drop down menu box 218 presents all available languages in the selected language, e.g., English. Alternatively, drop down menu box 218 may present each available language in that language, e.g., drop down menu box 218 could present the English option in the English language and the Japanese option in the Japanese language. The user can select the desired language in box 218, e.g., with a mouse. If the user selects a new language other than the default language (step 302), such as Japanese, system 10 executes HTML script of page 208 and overrides the existing parameters 222) [see fig.7 and the discussion beginning at col.7, line 9 and col.9, line 4]. Also, Kennelly teaches assigning to at least one word in the electronic file a plurality of identifiers, wherein each identifier corresponds to a one of a plurality respective translations in the electronic file for the at least one word (e.g., displays each of the available languages in a drop down menu box 218 of page 208... down menu box 218 of page 208 presents all available languages); and using an identifier from the plurality of identifiers, wherein the identifier corresponds to the language selected by the user, to obtain, from the respective translations in the electronic file, a translation, in the language selected by the user for the at least one word (e.g., when a user accesses system 10 and selects an Administrator page 208 (FIG.*

7), logic within the management object that produces page 208 causes management object request processor 156 (FIG. 4) to traverse language directories 204, 205, 206 and determine which languages are available to the user. Each time the user selects Administrator page 208, management object request processor 156 reads all the subdirectories under root directory 220 and looks for the existence of corresponding data files 220en, 220jp, 220fr, e.g., language.txt. The data files 220en, 220jp, 220fr contain information regarding the corresponding languages. When management object request processor 156 locates a language.txt file in a subdirectory, processor 156 presumes that system 10 supports the corresponding language. Subsequently, system 10 displays each of the available languages in a drop down menu box 218 of page 208. (FIG. 7) Drop down menu box 218 presents all available languages in the selected language, e.g., English. Alternatively, drop down menu box 218 may present each available language in that language, e.g., drop down menu box 218 could present the English option in the English language and the Japanese option in the Japanese language. The user can select the desired language in box 218, e.g., with a mouse. If the user selects a new language other than the default language (step 302), such as Japanese) [see fig.7 and the discussion beginning at col.7, line 9 and col.9, line 4].

Applicant argues in substance that Kennelly do not teach *receiving the electronic file from at the user's computer... a second plurality of phrases that are expressed in the language selected by the user* [Remarks, page 6].

In response, the Examiner respectfully submits that Kennelly is combined with Flanagan to teach “the electronic file’s content includes a first of phrases, wherein each phrase of the first plurality of phrase is expressed in a plurality of languages and has a meaning that is different than the meanings of other phrases of the first plurality of phrases regardless of the language in which the each phrase is expressed” and “ at the user’s computer, selecting, for the display to the user, from the first plurality of phrases, a second plurality of phrases that are expressed in the language selected by the user (*e.g., system 10 displays each of the available languages in a drop down menu box 218 of page 208. (FIG. 7)* Drop down menu box 218 presents all available languages in the selected language, *e.g., English. Alternatively, drop down menu box 218 may present each available language in that language, e.g., drop down menu box 218 could present the English option in the English language and the Japanese option in the Japanese language. The user can select the desired language in box 218, e.g., with a mouse. If the user selects a new language other than the default language (step 302), such as Japanese, system 10 executes HTML script of page 208 and overrides the existing parameters 222) [see fig. 7 and the discussion beginning at col. 7, line 9 and col. 9, line 4].*

### Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2176

- Kurachi et al.            US Pat. No. 6,092,035            Issued: Jul. 18, 2000
- Chaddha                US Pat. No. 6,345,293            Issued: Feb. 5, 2002
- Chaddha                US Pat. No. 6,647,425            Issued: Nov. 11, 2003
- T. Sakaguchi, "*A Browsing Tool for Multi-lingual Documents for Users without Multi-lingual Fonts*," ACM International Conference on Digital Libraries, pp.63-71, March 1996.

5.    **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

### **Contact information**

6.    Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Art Unit: 2176

4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**  
Commissioner for patents  
P O Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Maikhanh Nguyen

  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**